



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,511	10/23/2003	Shiro Miyamori	031192	6053

23850 7590 11/16/2004

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP  
1725 K STREET, NW  
SUITE 1000  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

JIMENEZ, MARC QUEMUEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3726

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/690,511

Applicant(s)

MIYAMORI ET AL.

Examiner

Marc Jimenez

Art Unit

3726

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 17-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-8 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(c) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. **Claims 17-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Murakami et al. (US 4,766,843).

Murakami et al. teach a crown shaped roll **1** having a metal core **1a**, and a rubber material **2** on the metal core **1a**. The patentability of product does not depend on its method of production. *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 697, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citing *In re Pilkington*, 411 F.2d 1345, 1348, 162 USPQ 145, 147 (CCPA 1969)). If a product in a product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product in the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product is made by a different process. *Id.* citing *In re Marosi*, 710 F.2d 799, 803, 218 USPQ 289, 292-93 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Johnson & Johnson v. W.L. Gore*, 436 F. Supp. 704, 726, 195 USPQ 487, 506 (D. Del. 1977); see also *In re Fessmann*, 489 F.2d 742, 744, 180 USPQ 324, 326 (CCPA 1974).

Art Unit: 3726

3. **Claims 17-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ishikawa et al. (US 6,652,433).

Ishikawa et al. teach a crown shaped roll (figure 6) having a metal core **12**, and a rubber material **14** on the metal core **12**. The patentability of product does not depend on its method of production. *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 697, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citing *In re Pilkington*, 411 F.2d 1345, 1348, 162 USPQ 145, 147 (CCPA 1969)). If a product in a product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product in the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product is made by a different process. *Id.* citing *In re Marosi*, 710 F.2d 799, 803, 218 USPQ 289, 292-93 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Johnson & Johnson v. W.L. Gore*, 436 F. Supp. 704, 726, 195 USPQ 487, 506 (D. Del. 1977); see also *In re Fessmann*, 489 F.2d 742, 744, 180 USPQ 324, 326 (CCPA 1974).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 21-24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami et al. in view of Kodama (US 6,458,063).

Murakami et al. teach the invention cited with the exception of using silica as a filler.

Kodama teaches an electrically conductive roller including silica as a filler (col. 3, line

Art Unit: 3726

60) in the electrically conductive layer 2.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided the invention of Murakami et al. with silica as a filler, in light of the teachings of Kodama, in order to provide a reinforcing material.

6. **Claims 21-24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa et al. in view of Kodama (US 6,458,063).

Ishikawa et al. teach the invention cited with the exception of using silica as a filler.

Kodama teaches an electrically conductive roller including silica as a filler (col. 3, line 60) in the electrically conductive layer 2.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided the invention of Ishikawa et al. with silica as a filler, in light of the teachings of Kodama, in order to provide a reinforcing material.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 17-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


Art Unit: 3726

***Contact Information***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc Jimenez whose telephone number is (703) 306-5965. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday between 5:30 a.m.-2:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (703) 308-1789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Marc Jimenez  
Patent Examiner  
AU 3726

**MJ**

November 13, 2004